	Case 2:07-cv-01967-JCC	Document 42	Filed 06/26/08	Page 1 of 3
01				
02				
03				
04				
05				
	LINUTED		ICT COLIDT	
06	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON			
07	AT SEATTLE			
08	RICKY M. ARNTSEN,	) CAS	SE NO. C07-1967	-JCC-MAT
09	Plaintiff,	)		
10	v.	) ORI	DER RE: PLAINT	TIFF'S MOTIONS
11	STEVEN CLARK, et al.,	)		
12	Defendants.	)		
13		)		
14	Plaintiff is a Washington state prisoner who is proceeding pro se in this action brought			
15	under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On April 28, 2008, the Court issued an Order setting a pretrial deadline			
16	for discovery of July 1, 2008. (Dkt. No. 24). Both parties have filed motions for summary			
17	judgment. (Dkt. Nos. 26, 35). Recently, defendants filed a motion to stay further discovery			
18	pending resolution of the motions for summary judgment (Dkt. No. 39), and plaintiff filed a			
19	motion for an extension of time to conduct further discovery and also to prepare a reply to			
20	defendants' response to plaintiff's motion for summary judgment. (Dkt. No. 41). Having			
21	reviewed plaintiff's motion for an extension of time and defendants' motion to stay discovery, and			
22	the balance of the record, the Court does hereby find and ORDER as follows:			
	ORDER RE: PLAINTIFF'S MOTIONS PAGE 1			

02 03

01

05

06

07

14

13

15

16

17

19

18

20 21

22

(1) Plaintiff alleges in his complaint that his civil rights were violated by two Seattle police officers when they arrested plaintiff in October and December of 2005. (Dkt. No. 18 at 2-3). These arrests apparently led to a criminal trial at which plaintiff, who represented himself, was able to question the officers about the arrests. (Dkt. No. 26, Attachment). Plaintiff attached portions of the officers' testimony to his motion for summary judgment, which he filed on May 16, 2008. (Id.)

In light of the fact that plaintiff filed his motion for summary judgment six weeks before the deadline for discovery elapsed, and the fact that plaintiff supported his motion with testimony 09 from his trial, it appears that further discovery is not necessary to resolve that motion. If, however, upon consideration of plaintiff's motion for summary judgment, the Court determines that further discovery would be helpful to the motion's resolution, the Court will consider extending the deadline. Accordingly, the Court defers consideration of plaintiff's motion for an extension of time to conduct discovery until the Court has resolved plaintiff's pending motion for summary judgment. To the extent that plaintiff also requests additional time to file a reply to defendants' response to his motion for summary judgment, plaintiff's request is DENIED as untimely since it was filed ten days after the reply was due.<sup>1</sup>

(2) Plaintiff is advised that defendants' motion for summary judgment is noted for July 11, 2008. (Dkt. No. 35). Accordingly, his response to the motion is due no later than **July 7**,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment was noted for consideration on June 13, 2008. (Dkt. No. 26). Therefore, plaintiff's reply was due no later than June 13, 2008. See Local Rule CR 7(d)(3). Because he filed his request for an extension of time after this deadline had passed, plaintiff must show "excusable neglect." Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(B). However, plaintiff's motion does not address this standard nor does it cite facts that would satisfy it.

(3) Because the Court has deferred consideration of plaintiff's motion to extend discovery, and in view of the fact that the current deadline for discovery expires shortly on July 1, 2008, defendants' motion to stay discovery (Dkt. No. 39) while the motions for summary judgment are considered is DENIED as moot.

(4) The Clerk is directed to send a copy of this Order to plaintiff, to counsel for defendants, and to the Honorable John C. Coughenour.

DATED this 26th day of June, 2008.

Mary Alice Theiler

United States Magistrate Judge

ORDER RE: PLAINTIFF'S MOTIONS

PAGE 3